

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR James Tobin	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,338	(08/07/2001		22058-516-DIV-CON	
30623	7590	02/21/2003			
•		HN, FERRIS, G	EXAMINER		
AND POPE	,	NTED	MERTZ, PREMA MARIA		
BOSTON, MA 02111				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1646	
				DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/924,338**

Applicant(s)

Examiner

Art Unit

Prema Mertz

1646

James Tobin



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover she	et with	the correspondence address				
	or Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the								
mailing If the p If NO p Failure Any re	date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply at to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ne statutory minimum o and will expire SIX (6) ne application to becon	of thirty (30 MONTHS fi ne ABANDO	D) days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Dec 27, 2</u>	002		·				
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This action is non-final.							
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	tion of Claims							
4) 💢	Claim(s) 18 and 38-58	·		is/are pending in the application.				
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)			is/are withdrawn from consideration.				
	Claim(s)							
6) 💢	Claim(s) 18 and 38-58			is/are rejected.				
7) 🗆	Claim(s)			is/are objected to.				
8) 🗆	Claims							
	tion Papers							
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) accepte	d or b)	\square objected to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d							
11) 🗌	The proposed drawing correction filed on							
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	to this Office ac	tion.					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	iner.						
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	riority under 35	U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) [☐ All b)☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been receive	d.					
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been receive	d in App	olication No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority do application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).					
*S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	e certified copi	es not r	eceived.				
14)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under	35 U.S.	C. § 119(e).				
a) 🗆	The translation of the foreign language provisiona							
15) 🗶	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under	35 U.S.	C. §§ 120 and/or 121.				
Attachm				2.440) B N. ()				
	tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	_		0-413) Paper No(s)				
_	2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:							
3) [X] Inf	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (P10-1449) Paper No(s).	or other:						

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group III (claim 18 and new claims 38-58) in Paper No. 8 (12/27/02) is acknowledged.

Claims 1-17, 19-37 have been canceled in Paper No. 8 (12/27/02).

Specification

- 2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. It is suggested that the title be amended to recite the antibody being claimed.
- 3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because there is no mention in the instant abstract of the antibodies being claimed. Correction is required. See MPEP. § 608.01(b).

 Claim rejections-35 USC § 112, first paragraph
- 4. Claims 18, 38-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for an antibody to a protein comprising the amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, does not reasonably provide enablement for "all" antibodies to "all"human IL-11R proteins. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The specification delimits the instant protein by reference to specific amino acid arrays as set forth in SEQ ID NO:2, however, in claims 18, 38-41, 51-58, the protein is defined by

Art Unit: 1646

reference to the abbreviation IL-11R, wherein the abbreviation itself does not represent any distinguishing information concerning the disclosed protein. Moreover because the specification on page 3, lines 16-17, recites that "preferably" the protein has a biological activity of the IL-11R", this abbreviation does not inherently correspond to a particular cytokine receptor, and claims that lack the recitation of structural properties encompass subject matter not supported by the instant specification. Molecules that are embraced by the claims are not adequately supported by the instant specification because the specification provides no guidance for how to make such molecules nor are examples provided as to how these ,molecules would be identified commensurate with the breadth of the claims. In the absence of an appropriate structural and/or functional reference, a person of ordinary skill in the art would be unable to make and use the antibody molecules embraced by the claims without undue experimentation because one could not distinguish the proteins envisaged by the specification and those which are unrelated.

With respect to claims 18, 38-41, 51-58, as recited, what is claimed in the instant invention broadly encompasses "all" antibodies to "all" IL-11R proteins, including variants thereof. While the specification discloses that the biological property which the IL-11R polypeptide is expected to exhibit (page 11, lines 1-18), the specification is non-enabling for the unlimited number of compositions comprising an antibody to a IL-11R protein, and which are encompassed by the scope of the claims. Claim 18 is a single means claim (M.P.E.P. 2164.08(a)). In In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 218 USPQ 195 (Fed. Cir. 1983), the Courts have held that: "A single means claim, i.e. where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another

Art Unit: 1646

recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph." (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor). Since no material limitations for the antibody to the IL-11R protein have been recited in the claim, the claim encompasses every conceivable structure (means) for achieving the stated property (result), a fact situation comparable to Hvatt. The claimed invention encompasses compositions not envisioned or described in the specification, and neither does the specification disclose how these claimed compositions can be distinguished from each other. The specification only enables antibodies to a protein having the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2, the polypeptide having specific characteristics and properties (see page 11, lines 1-18). These properties may differ structurally, chemically and physically from other known proteins. By application of the factors set forth in Ex parte Forman (230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1986), and reiterated in In re Wands (858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)), which include (1) quantity of experimentation, (2) guidance presented, (3) the predictability of the art, and (4) the breadth of the claims, in the instant application, the quantity of experimentation to determine which antibodies to other IL-11R proteins are encompassed by the scope of the claims is practically infinite and the guidance provided in the specification very little, thereby rendering the results of the assays taught in the specification unpredictable (see Example 5, page 31). Therefore, it would require undue experimentation to determine which antibodies to which IL-11R proteins, would be encompassed by the scope of the

Art Unit: 1646

claims. The disclosure of a natural polypeptide of SEQ ID NO:2 is clearly insufficient support under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 for claims which encompass antibodies to every and all polypeptides, including mutants thereof. In <u>In re Fisher</u>, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970), the Courts have held that:

"Inventor should be allowed to dominate future patentable inventions of others where those inventions were based in some way on his teachings, since some improvements while unobvious from his teachings, are still within his contribution, since improvement was made possible by his work; however, he must not be permitted to achieve this dominance by claims which are insufficiently supported and hence, not in compliance with first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112; that paragraph requires that the scope of the claims must bear a reasonable correlation to scope of enablement provided by specification to persons of ordinary skill in the art; in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, a single embodiment provides broad enablement in the sense that, once imagined, other embodiments can be made without difficulty and their performance characteristics predicted by resort to known scientific law; in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, scope of enablement varies inversely with degree of unpredictability of factors involved."

Furthermore, the amount of embodiments corresponding to the desirable compositions, may be innumerable, and the enabled embodiment amount to only one (SEQ ID NO:2).

Therefore, there are substantial scientific reasons to doubt the scope of enablement, as set forth above. Reasonable correlation must exist between the scope of the claims and scope of enablement set forth. The specification does not describe antibodies to any other polypeptide other than that whose amino acid sequence is shown in SEQ ID NO:2, and since it is deemed to constitute undue experimentation to determine all the others, the disclosure is not commensurate with the scope of the claims. Therefore, Applicants are not enabled for antibodies to a IL-11R protein having anything less than the amino acid sequence shown in SEQ ID NO:2. It is

Art Unit: 1646

suggested that by employing conventional claim language, the claims be amended to include the SEQ ID NO of the specific polypeptide supported by the instant specification.

Claim rejections-35 USC § 112, second paragraph

5. Claims 18, 38-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 18 is rejected as vague and indefinite for reciting "IL-11R" because the full meaning of the acronym "IL-11R" should be stated at its first use in any independent claim.

Claims 38-56 are rejected as vague and indefinite insofar as they depend on claim 18 for this limitation.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Claims 11, 38-58 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, set forth in this Office action.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prema Mertz whose telephone number is (703) 308-4229. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00AM to 3:30PM (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, can be reached on (703) 308-6564.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 305-3014 or (703 308-4242. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 746-5300.

Art Unit: 1646

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [yvonne.eyler@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Prema Mertz Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1646
January 22, 2003